

REMARKS

Claim 25 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 13 to 25 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

Claims 13 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,311,346 to Haas, et al. ("Haas reference") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,414 to Fishman ("Fishman reference").

The Haas reference purportedly concerns reducing the polarization-dependent distortion of an optical signal transmitted through an optical fiber by aligning the polarization of the optical signal to minimize the received signal distortion. The reference further recites that a polarization controller may be located at either the input or output end of a long haul optical fiber system and is used to align the polarization of the signal to minimized the received signal distortion.

The Fishman reference purportedly concerns the effect of polarization mode dispersion that an optical signal experiences as it propagates through an optical transmission fiber which is compensated for at a receiver using a birefringent compensator. Specifically, the cited passage of col. 5, line 8, to col. 11, line 38, of the Fishman reference recites in-part that a desired feedback signal is generated at the output of a compensator by monitoring the amount of distortion due to the differential time delay in the optical signal after it has traveled through the compensator.

The cited Haas and Fishman references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the present claims. Claim 13 of the present invention concerns a method for reducing distortion of an optical pulse contained in a communication-transmitting luminous flux in an optical communication system caused by polarization mode dispersion. As discussed, claim 13 requires, among other features, using a small, coupled-out portion of the communication-transmitting luminous flux to determine the transmission quality of the optical communication system. As discussed herein, neither the Haas and Fishman references appear to have this feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Haas and Fishman references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 13. Claims 14 to 16 depend from claim 13 and are allowable for the same reasons. Claim 17 and its dependent claims 18 to 24, recite features analogous to claim 13, and are therefore allowable for essentially

the same reasons as claim 13. Claim 25 depends ultimately from claim 13 and is allowable for the same reasons as claim 13. No new matter has been added.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 to 25, are allowable; and, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 to 24 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claims 13 to 25 are allowable, and that the rejections of claims 13 to 24 have been overcome. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present application issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept 24, 2007

By: 
Linda Shudy Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646